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Author's response to reviews: see over
Thank you for your comments and the reviewers comments regarding the remaining issues in our manuscript

“Perceived exertion, comfort and working technique in professional computer users and associations with the incidence of neck and upper extremity symptoms “

In this second revised version of the paper we have tried to clarify the writing in line with the remarks from one of the reviewers (Jack Dennerlein). Moreover, we have corrected the minor revisions regarding the grammar raised by reviewer number 2 (Dick Finlay). The revised paper has been resubmitted electronically as requested.

Response to the comments by reviewer Prof Dick Finlay: 

All the parts with incorrect grammar have been corrected according to the proposals from the reviewer.

Response to the comments by Prof Jack Dennerlein: 

1) Clarity in writing is lacking in several places throughout the manuscript.

a) The direction of the association of comfort and pain is unstated. Is more or less comfort associated?

Response: In the abstract and in the result part of the paper we have now clarified the direction of the association in line with the appropriate remark from the reviewer.

b) The added text just before the hypothesis has too many thoughts and the logic is unclear. It is unclear how this statement adds to justifying the hypothesis.

Response: The text has been clarified, rearranged and extended (for example new references are added) and the logic of the underlying hypothesis has been explained in an extended way in order to justify the research questions posed.

c) In the first paragraph in the discussion it is unclear how the second part relates to the first part of the sentence. The model there is exposure and exertion- this study is about exertion and pain.

Response: This has now been clarified in line with the comments.

d) The first part of the discussion is way to long with to many different thoughts. A paragraph should contain one main topic. Suggest reorganizing the thoughts here.

Response: This part has been reorganized and shortened in line with the comment from the reviewer.
e) The rationale for controlling should be in the method part of the paper.

Response: This part has now been moved the method part of the manuscript.

f) The added sentence just before the “Strengths and limitation part” it is unclear how this study provides what the authors deem “objective” measurements.

Response: The ambiguity regarding this sentence has now been clarified. We did not mean that perceived exertion and comfort were objective measurements, but I agree with the reviewer that it could be interpreted like that.

2) While a list of professions was provided, the reviewers were expecting a table listing traditional demographic of the population as in the case I many epi-studies. Also to understand how various co-variates may be related to the outcome.

Response: Such a table has in this revised manuscript been added.

3. The authors state several times that the validity of self-reports has been questioned. This seems a bit of a subjective statement.

Response: Several references justifying this statement have been added in the revised paper.

4. The added statement, the last sentence in the conclusion seems misplaced here without any supporting discussion. The idea of the application of these results seems worthy of discussion in the discussion section.

Response: The conclusion has been changed and a clarifying sentence has been added in the discussion part.